



EUGENE OAK, Ph.D., J.D., Immigrations & Patent Attorney

610 S. Van Ness Ave., Los Angeles, California 90005
Tel: (213) 365-2229, Fax: (213) 365-2878

3611
✓ EAP

July 24, 2004

Commissioner of Patents & Trademark
United States Patent & Trademark Office
Washington, D.C., 20231

TEL: 703-308-1011
FAX: 703-872-9326

Examiner: Brian K. Green

ART UNIT 3611

RE: Response to Advisory Action and Request for extension for response within first month.

Applicant: LEE, Charles Hee
Application No.: 10/086,800

Attorney Docket No.: 911-9278

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Transmitted herewith for filing are amendments of the above-identified patent application according to the Advisory Action Mailed on July 16, 2004 and a request for an extension for response within first month. Thank you for your prompt response and kind consideration. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Oak, Ph. D., J. D.
Patent Attorney
EO/ycc/pk

Enclosures: Amendments

\$55 checks for extension for response within first month.

01 FG:2251
07/30/2004 SHINASS1 00000008 10086800
55.00 0P



Summary of the Response to Office Action

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species I., figures 1-5 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged.

Claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowability generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 9.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing corrections filed on Aug. 20, 2003 have been received. The proposed drawing correction for figures 1-4, 8a, 8b have been approved. In figures 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, the applicant failed to show any proposed (i.e. darkened flaps 13) represent. Do the dark areas represent the adhesive? The drawings fail to show numerical "63-1" as defined in the specification, page 7, last paragraph and page 8, first paragraph. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because on line 3 the applicant should not refer to figure 1 to define the shape. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The shape of the card preparing material is amended as 'Firstly, a paper is cut into a shape of a long rectangle which is divided into three equal sections and one of which, the first section, has a window at the center therefore and three

trapezoidal wings are formed along the three edges thereof, to one end of the short side of the rectangle, opposite to the first section, is connected a distorted trapezoid along the bottom side of which one trapezoid wing is developed.

The proposed changes to the specification, page 4, have not been entered since they are improper format. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 4, line 9, "star." should apparently be "star,". Page 4, line 15, "invitatory" should apparently be "invitational". Appropriate correction is required.

Those misprints are properly amended in the following 'Amendment section'.

The amendment filed 9/30/03 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: starting on page 11 of the amendment (page 6 paragraph 1 of the specification) "trapezoid form, whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form". Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The new matter "trapezoid form, whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form" is canceled.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 5, line 1, "with;" should apparently be "with:"

In claim 5, line 3, "the first portion" should be "a first portion".

In claim 5, line 4, "the center" should be an "a center".

In claim 5, line 8, "form" should be "forms".

In claim 5, line 8, "the third portion" should be "a third portion".

In claim 5, line 8, "rectangular form" should be "the rectangular forms".

In claim 5, line 10, "color" should be "colors".

In claim 5, line 12, ", on which peel off glues are adhered," should be

canceled.

In claim 5, line 13, “the second portion” should be “a second portion”.

In claim 5, line 14, “, on which peel off glue is attached,” should be canceled .

In claim 5, line 16, “the center” should be “a center”.

In claim 5, line 22, “second portions” should be “second portion”.

In claim 5, line 24, “third and fourth portion” should be “third and fourth portions”.

In claim 5, line 25, “slightly press the folded card with hands” is awkward and should be rewritten. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 5 is amended appropriately.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Stating in claim 5, line 7, “trapezoid form, whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form” is considered to be new matter since the specification and drawings, as originally filed, fail to provide support for the newly added language.

The wording “, whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form” is deleted.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, line 4, “ a window of various shape” is confusing since it is not understood how a single window can have various shape, i.e. a window

can only include a single shape. The applicant could cancel the phrase “of various shape” to overcome the indefinite problem.

In claim 5, lines 5-6, the following phrase is awkward and confusing “ on which peel off glues are attached, are developed on the three edges”, i.e. it is not clear what “ developed on the three edges” means.

In claim 5, line 10, “ threads of different color, decorated fabric” is awkward and confusing.

In claim 5, line 11, “six pieces of peel off glues” is indefinite since it is not clear whether the six pieces of peel off glue are part of the peel off glues defined earlier in the claim or are additional peel off glues.

In claim 5, line 11, “ by; a) folding” is awkward and confusing. In claim 5, line 14, there is no antecedent basis for “the wing”.

In claim 5, lines 14-15, there is no antecedent basis for “the fourth portion”.

In claim 5, line 15, it is not clear which wing is being referred to in the phrase “the wing face”.

In claim 5, line 19, there is no antecedent basis for the “peels”.

In claim 5, line 20, there is no antecedent basis for “the embroidered fabrics”.

In claim 5, lines 22-23, “of the card stock face each other, and third and fourth portion of the card stock face each other” is awkward and confusing.

In claim 5, line 24, there is no antecedent basis for “the folded card”.